

NICHOLAS J. SANTORO

(Nevada Bar No. 532)

JASON D. SMITH

(Nevada Bar No. 9691)

HOLLEY DRIGGS LTD

300 South 4th Street, Suite 1600

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Tel.: (702) 791-0308

Email: nsantoro@nevadafirm.com

jsmith@nevadafirm.com

PETER A. SWANSON

(pro hac vice)

GARY M. RUBMAN

(pro hac vice)

SIMEON BOTWINICK

(pro hac vice)

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

One CityCenter

850 Tenth Street, NW

Washington, DC 20001

Tel.: (202) 662-6000

Email: pswanson@cov.com

grubman@cov.com

sbotwinick@cov.com

ZIWEI SONG

(pro hac vice)

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

Salesforce Tower

415 Mission Street, Suite 5400

San Francisco, CA 94105-2533

Tel.: (415) 591-6000

Email: ksong@cov.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Aristocrat Technologies, Inc.
and Aristocrat Technologies Australia Pty Ltd.*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ARISTOCRAT TECHNOLOGIES, INC. and
ARISTOCRAT TECHNOLOGIES
AUSTRALIA PTY LTD.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

LIGHT & WONDER, INC., LNW GAMING,
INC., and SCIPLAY CORPORATION,

Defendants.

Civil Case No.: 2:24-cv-00382-GMN-MDC

**PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION TO LIFT STAY OF
DISCOVERY AND ORDER
DISCOVERY ON MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

1 Plaintiffs Aristocrat Technologies, Inc. and Aristocrat Technologies Australia Pty Ltd.
2 (collectively, “Aristocrat”) respectfully submit this short reply in support of their motion to lift the
3 stay of discovery and order production of certain documents related to Aristocrat’s request for a
4 preliminary injunction on its trade secret claims (ECF No. 55) (the “Discovery Motion”).

5 After Aristocrat filed the Discovery Motion, the Court ordered that further briefing on
6 Aristocrat’s preliminary injunction motion would be deferred until Defendants’ (“L&W’s”) motion to dismiss is resolved. *See* ECF No. 61. In light of this ruling, Aristocrat withdraws its
7 request in the Discovery Motion that the Court lift the discovery stay.
8

9 Like the preliminary injunction motion, however, resolution of the Discovery Motion
10 should await the Court’s decision on the motion to dismiss. Should the Court decline to dismiss
11 the trade secret claims, the stay will be lifted, and discovery will proceed, at least as to those claims,
12 and briefing will resume on the preliminary injunction motion. In that event, L&W should be
13 required to make a prompt production of the six categories of documents requested in the
14 Discovery Motion (the “Requested Documents”). As explained in the Discovery Motion, this
15 targeted discovery is highly relevant to the preliminary injunction motion and would not impose
16 an undue burden on L&W to collect and produce. *See* ECF No. 55 at 7–11. Accordingly, if the
17 Court denies L&W’s motion to dismiss the trade secret claims (or if the Court otherwise lifts the
18 stay), the Court should order L&W to produce these critical documents without further delay.

19 L&W’s opposition to the Discovery Motion (ECF No. 62) does not deny the relevance of
20 the Requested Documents to Aristocrat’s trade secret claims and its pending preliminary injunction
21 motion. Indeed, L&W barely addresses the Requested Documents at all, instead spending the bulk
22 of the opposition arguing that “discovery should remain stayed until the resolution of L&W’s
23 Motion to Dismiss.” ECF No. 62 at 5. That objection is moot given that, as stated above, Aristocrat
24 no longer seeks to lift the stay in connection with the Discovery Motion.¹

25
26
27 ¹ Aristocrat timely filed objections to the stay order. ECF No. 60. Unlike the Discovery Motion,
28 those objections do not seek to lift the stay based on the filing of the preliminary injunction motion, but rather they concern whether the stay should have been granted in the first place. Aristocrat maintains its objections to the stay order.

Accordingly, Aristocrat respectfully requests that the Court (1) hold the Discovery Motion in abeyance pending the Court's ruling on the motion to dismiss and (2) if the Court declines to dismiss the trade secret claims or otherwise lifts the discovery stay, order L&W to produce the Requested Documents within 10 days of the ruling on the motion to dismiss or the lifting of the stay.

June 14, 2024

/s/ Jason D. Smith

NICHOLAS J. SANTORO

(Nevada Bar No. 532)

JASON D. SMITH

(Nevada Bar No. 9691)

HOLLEY DRIGGS LTD

300 South 4th Street, Suite 1600

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Tel.: (702) 791-0308

Email: nsantoro@nevadafirm.com

jsmith@nevadafirm.com

PETER SWANSON

(*pro hac vice*)

GARY RUBMAN

(*pro hac vice*)

SIMEON BOTWINICK

(*pro hac vice*)

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

One CityCenter

850 Tenth Street, NW, Washington, DC 20001

Tel.: (202) 662-6000

Email: pswanson@cov.com

grubman@cov.com

sbotwinick@cov.com

ZIWEI SONG

(*pro hac vice*)

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

Salesforce Tower

415 Mission Street, Suite 5400

San Francisco, CA 94105-2533

Tel.: (415) 591-6000

Email: ksong@cov.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Aristocrat
Technologies, Inc. and Aristocrat
Technologies Australia Pty Ltd.*